

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the office action mailed December 6, 2006. Applicant further thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview held on January 23, 2007, and the present amended is intended to implement the conclusions of our meeting. The present amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection raised by the Examiner, and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance is hereby solicited.

Applicant herein amends claims 1, 8 – 12, 18 – 21, 23, 28 - 30, 40 and 43. Support for the amendments is found in the originally filed specification and claims. No new matter is added by these amendments. Claims 1 - 44 remain in the case.

SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

A telephonic interview was held on January 23, 2007. The differences between LeCreff and the subject invention were discussed, particularly in relation to claims 1 and 21. It was clarified that the subject invention supplies operating power to the powered device for a limited time period, unlike LeCreff, which merely transmits a signal indicative of the lack of power. It was agreed that positively reciting that the supplied power is sufficient to fully power the detected attached powered device overcomes the prior art of record.

The difference between Watamoto, LeCreff and the subject invention were discussed, particularly in relation to claims 21, and 40 – 43. It was clarified that Watamoto provides a timer in the device to notify the user of a shut down event. The power is not supplied responsive to an excess demand condition, nor can Watamoto determine an excess demand condition.

As regarding claim 21, it was agreed that positively reciting that the supplied power is sufficient to fully power the detected attached powered device overcomes the prior art of record.

As regarding claims 40 – 43, it was agreed that positively reciting that the stored time marker is associated with a powering up event overcomes the prior art of record. This is